

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application for the Examiner's review and consideration. Claims 1, 6, 13, 18, 25, and 34 have been amended to further clarify the invention. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102, §103

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16, 18-22, 24-32, and 34-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated over How to Clean Practically Anything by Florman *et al.* ("Florman"). Further, Claims 5, 11, 17, 23, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Florman in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,775,935 to Yourick ("Yourick") and U.S. Patent No. 5,710,884 to Dedrick ("Dedrick"). Applicants respectfully traverse and obviate the rejection.

On pages 6 of the Office Action, it alleges that boosters and detergents do generally contain characteristic ingredients. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, overcome the arguments set forth by the Office Action.

On pages 6-7 of the Office Action, it alleges that Florman infers that most consumers are loyal to brand names, trade dress and container graphics, etc and will use all fabric care products from the same manufacturer when they find a product that is successful in the laundry. Applicants respectfully submit that loyalty to a brand name does not suggest methods for caring for fabrics wherein, among other elements, the fabric treatment composition and the laundry detergent composition possess one or more coordinated elements selected from a brand name, container graphics, containers, the dosages per container, a dye, a perfume, a trade dress, and combinations thereof. While Applicants do not dispute that customers are loyal to brand names, trade dress and container graphics, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Florman that consumers purchase and/or use products whereby elements, such as brand name, container graphics, containers, the dosages per container, a dye, a perfume, a trade dress, and combinations thereof are coordinated. Indeed, as a nonlimiting example, laundry detergent compositions, such as All®, and fabric treatment compositions, such as Snuggle®, have very loyal followings, are produced by the same manufacturer (Unilever) and are well known. However, these compositions do not possess similar brand names, trade dress nor container graphics. Further, for the reasons

given above, Applicants submit that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Florman that would cause one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize fabric treatment compositions and laundry detergent compositions possessing one or more coordinated elements selected from a brand name, container graphics, containers, the dosages per container, a dye, a perfume, a trade dress, and combinations thereof.

Further, Florman teaches away from the present invention. As pointed out by the Office Action, Florman discloses that one could save the most money by forgetting brand loyalty. *See, e.g.*, Florman page 97, Prices. Applicants respectfully submit that this teaching completely opposes the coordinated elements suggested by the present invention. The present invention discloses methods for caring for fabrics wherein, among other elements, the fabric treatment composition and the laundry detergent composition possess one or more coordinated elements selected from a brand name, container graphics, containers, the dosages per container, a dye, a perfume, a trade dress, and combinations thereof. Using brand names, in a coordinated fashion, is an optional element of the present invention. "Forgetting" brand names, as disclosed by Florman, would render coordinating elements such as a brand name impossible.

Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, overcome the arguments set forth by the Office Action.

With regard to all claims not specifically mentioned, these are believed to be allowable not only in view of their dependency on their respective base claims and any intervening claims, but also for the totality of features recited therein.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicant to arrange for a telephonic interview in an effort to expedite the prosecution of this matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due for the amendments herein. Should any fee be required, please charge such fee to Procter & Gamble Deposit Account No. 16-2480.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark A. Charles

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 51,547

Tel. No. (513) 627-4229

Dated: August 3, 2004

Customer Number: 27752